

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the Office Action. Claims 1-35 were canceled in a previous paper, claims 36, 40, 41, 45, 48, and 51 are amended, and new claims 54-57 are added. Claims 36-57 are now pending in light of the new claims.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

I. General Considerations

A. Claim Amendments and/or Cancellations

With particular reference to the claim amendments, Applicant notes that while claims 36, 40, 41, 45, 48, and 51 have been amended herein, such amendments have been made in the interest of expediting the allowance of this case. Notwithstanding, Applicant, may, on further consideration, determine that claims of broader scope than those now presented are supported. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to file one or more continuing applications with claims broader in scope than the claims now presented.

Consistent with the points set forth above, Applicant submits that neither the claim amendments set forth herein, nor any other claim amendments, claim cancellations or statements advanced by the Applicant in this or any related case, constitute or should be construed as, an implicit or explicit surrender or disclaimer of claim scope with respect to the cited, or any other, references.

B. Remarks

Applicant respectfully notes that the remarks herein do not constitute, nor are they intended to be, an exhaustive enumeration of the patentable distinctions between any cited references and the invention, example embodiments of which are set forth in the claims of this application. Rather, and in consideration of the fact that various factors make it impractical to enumerate all the patentable distinctions between the invention and the cited art, as well as the fact that the Applicant has broad discretion in terms of the identification and consideration of the base(s) upon which the claims distinguish over the cited references, the distinctions identified and discussed herein are presented solely by way of example. Consistent with the foregoing, the discussion herein is not intended, and should not be construed, to prejudice or foreclose contemporaneous or future consideration by the Applicant, in this case or any other, of: additional or alternative distinctions between the invention and the cited references; and/or, the merits of additional or alternative arguments.

Applicant notes as well that the remarks, or a lack of remarks, set forth herein are not intended to constitute, and should not be construed as, an acquiescence, on the part of the Applicant: as to the purported teachings or prior art status of the cited references; as to the characterization of the cited references advanced by the Examiner; or as to any other assertions, allegations or characterizations made by the Examiner at any time in this case. Applicant reserves the right to challenge the purported teaching and prior art status of the cited references at any appropriate time.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 36-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated and/or obvious in light of various references and combinations thereof. Applicant respectfully disagrees but submits that in light of the discussion set forth below, the rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

A. Claims 36-44

By this paper, Applicant has amended claim 36 to recite in part “performing a procedure on a newly manufactured and previously uncalibrated component so as to generate calibration data concerning the component...and if the error is corrected, approving the component for distribution to a customer.” Support for this amendment can be found in the application at, for example, paragraphs [003], [021] and [027]. In contrast, the Examiner has not established that any of the cited references, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned limitations in combination with the other limitations of claim 36. Applicant thus respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 36, as well as the rejection of corresponding dependent claims 37-44, should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 45-47

By this paper, Applicant has amended claim 45 to recite in part “...generation of the calibration data being achieved in connection with physical interactions between the calibration devices and respective associated components... [and] comparing calibration data from one calibration device with calibration data from another calibration device...” Support for this amendment can be found in the application at, for example, paragraphs [009], [028], [031] and Figure 3. In contrast, the Examiner has not established that any of the cited references, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned limitations in combination with the other limitations of claim 45. Applicant thus respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 36, as well as the rejection of corresponding dependent claims 46-47, should be withdrawn.

C. Claims 48-53

By this paper, Applicant has amended claim 48 to recite in part "...receiving calibration data stored at each of the one or more calibrating devices, the calibration data received from each calibrating device including calibration data for each of a plurality of components previously processed by that calibrating device...storing the received calibration data in the storage source...identifying one or more errors in the accessed calibration data by comparing calibration data for each of the components; and transmitting a message to an operator of the calibrating device that is associated with the calibration data containing the one or more errors." Support for this amendment can be found in the application at, for example, paragraphs [008], [009], [011], and Figure 3. In contrast, the Examiner has not established that any of the cited references, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned limitations in combination with the other limitations of claim 48. Applicant thus respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 36, as well as the rejection of corresponding dependent claims 49-53, should be withdrawn.

III. New Claims 54-57

By this paper, Applicant has added new claims 54-57. New claims 54-57 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from one of claims 36, 45, or 48.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks submitted herein, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims 36-57 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections is requested and allowance of those claims is respectfully solicited. In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 21st day of November, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter F. Malen, Jr./Reg.# 45576

Peter F. Malen Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,576
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

PFM:ajb
W:\15436\98.1\PFM0000001505V001.doc